REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is herein amended. No new matter has been presented.

I. Claim Objection

Claim 1 was objected to due to an informality.

Claim 1 is herein amended. In light of this amendment, this objection is rendered moot.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kameyama et al. (US 2002/0015120) (hereinafter Kameyama) in view of Kawabata (JP2002-328233). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kawabata, as asserted by the Examiner, discloses that a thickness-direction retardation of a protective film is reduced to suppress change of display color or contrast by an angle of incidence light in a polarizing plate obtained by a combination with a polarizer. See Kawabata, paragraph [0023]. On the other hand, the presently claimed invention reduces the color shift amount when laminating a brightness enhancement film on a polarizing plate. Thus, the presently claimed invention achieves a completely different objective than Kawabata, which is unobvious from Kawabata.

Furthermore, Kawabata merely discloses that the polarizing plate, *i.e.* protective film, affects display color or contrast when incorporating the polarizing plate into a liquid crystal

display. See Kawabata, paragraph [0023]. Kawabata discloses that the polarizing plates are disposed on both sides of a liquid crystal cell. Thus, they are the "inner side protective films", *i.e.* the sides laminated with the liquid crystal cell with reference to a polarizer. The "inner side protective films" disposed on both sides of the liquid crystal cell affect the resulting liquid crystal display.

On the other hand, the presently claimed invention recites a thickness-direction retardation of "an outer side protective film" disposed on the outside (a side which is not laminated with a liquid crystal cell with reference to a polarizer) of a polarizing plate.

Thus, the presently claimed invention is unobvious from Kawabata with regards to this feature. Kameyama does not disclose, teach, suggest or provide any reason for achieving this feature. Thus, for at least this reason the presently claimed invention is unobvious from the cited art.

Moreover, Kameyama does not disclose, teach, suggest or provide any reason for a retardation of the protective film. Thus, there is no motivation or reason for a skilled artisan at the time of invention to apply the low retardation film disclosed in Kawabata to the protective film of Kameyama. Furthermore, Kameyama does not disclose, teach, suggest or provide any reason for using "the outer side protective film" in which the thickness-direction retardation as well as the in-plane retardation are controlled to be small, as in the presently claimed high-intensity polarizing plate.

Also, Kameyama does not disclose, teach, suggest or provide any reason for reducing the thickness-direction retardation of "the outer side protective film" of the high-intensity polarizing

plate laminated with the brightness enhancement film, which may eliminate the influence on linear polarization emitted from the brightness enhancement film and consequently control the color shift amount, so that it may be small. Kameyama does not disclose, teach, suggest or provide any reason for using the protective film having the reduced thickness-direction retardation as "the outer side protective film".

Furthermore, the presently claimed invention achieves unexpected results over the cited art. This can clearly be seen by comparing Example 1 with Comparative Example 1 and comparing Example 2 with Comparative Example 2, as disclosed in Applicants' specification. See Applicants' Specification, pages 41-43.

In disclosed Examples 1 and 2 the protective film A unexpectedly achieves a reduction in the color shift amount. The protective film A is used for "the outer side protective film" in the disclosed Examples 1 and 2 and satisfies the in-plane retardation and thickness-direction retardation recited in claim 1 of the present application.

On the other hand, in Comparative Examples 1 and 2 the protective film B does not achieve a reduction in color shift, as observed in Examples 1 and 2. Protective film B, which is used for "the outer side protective film" in Comparative Examples 1 and 2, does not satisfy the thickness-direction retardation as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit additional data in the attached Declaration under Rule §1.132. New Example 1 and New Example 2 are submitted as further proof of the unexpected results achieved by the presently claimed invention over the cited art.

The protective film A and protective film B used in New Examples 1 and 2 are the same protective films disclosed in Applicants' Specification and used in Examples 1 and 2 and Comparative Examples 1 and 2.

A feature of the presently claimed invention is the use of "the outer side protective film" having the reduced thickness-direction retardation. Features of the presently claimed invention, such as a reduction in color shift amount, may not be obtained when "an inner side protective film" having a reduced thickness-direction retardation is used.

In New Example 1, the protective film A is adhered to one side of the polarizer and the protective film B is adhered to another side of the polarizer. New Example 1 has a constitution of protective film B/polarizer/protective film A/adhesive layer/brightness enhancement film.

In New Example 2, the high-brightness polarizing plate is prepared the same as in New Example 1 except that the protective film B side of the polarizing plate is facing the brightness enhancement film A. New Example 2 has a constitution of protective film A/polarizer/protective film B/adhesive layer/brightness enhancement film.

New Examples 1 and 2 have the protective films A and B on both sides of the polarizer, respectively. However, the New Example 1, using the protective film A for the "outer side protection film", can reduce the color shift amount as compared to New Example 2, wherein the protective film B is used for "the outer side protective film." This can clearly be seen from the evaluation results disclosed in the Declaration. See Declaration, page 4.

Thus, the presently claimed high-intensity polarizing plate exhibits an unexpected and advantageous effect that is capable of satisfying the in-plane retardation and the thickness-

direction retardation as recited in claim 1 of the present application for "the outer side protective film" to reduce the color shift amount, as described above.

For at least the reasons herein discussed, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameyama et al. (US 2002/0015120) and Kawabata (JP2002-328233) in view of Admitted Prior Art (Admission).

Kameyama in view of Kawabata does not render the presently claimed invention obvious, as discussed above. The deficiencies of Kameyama in view of Kawabata are not overcome by the disclosure of the Admitted Prior Art.

Thus, the combined reading of Kameyama and Kawabata in view of Admitted Prior Art fails to render the presently claimed invention obvious.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the claim objection and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/BERNADETTE K. MCGANN/

Bernadette K. McGann
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 65,127
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

Attachment: Declaration under Rule §1.132

BKM/bam